arXiv:1609.09313v1 [physics.soc-ph] 29 Sep 2016

An Algebraic Solution for the Kermack-McKendrick Model

Alexsandro M. Carvalho*
Escola de Gestão e Negócios, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Economia, Universidade do Vale do Rio dos Sinos, Caixa Postal 275, 93022-000 São Leopoldo RS, Brazil

Sebastián Gonçalves†
Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Caixa Postal 15051, 90501-970 Porto Alegre RS, Brazil

We present an algebraic solution for the Susceptible-Infective-Removed (SIR) model originally presented by Kermack-McKendrick in 1927. Starting from the differential equation for the removed subjects presented by them in the original paper, we re-write it in a slightly different form in order to derive formally the solution, unless one integration. Then, using algebraic techniques and some well justified numerical assumptions we obtain an analytic solution for the integral. Finally, we compare the numerical solution of the differential equations of the SIR model with the analytically solution here proposed, showing an excellent agreement.

Keywords: SIR model, epidemic models, exact solution

I. INTRODUCTION

The Kermack-McKendrick model [1] or commonly called the SIR model is a cornerstone of the theoretical mathematical models applied to the dynamic of disease spreading, or simply epidemic models. Presented in 1927 in the Proceeding of Royal Society A, soon became evident that it represents an excellent frame for the understanding of the behavior of epidemics.

The basic reproductive number $R_0 = \beta\tau$, the infection curve (that is the asymptotic number of removed as function of R_0) are concepts that found in the SIR model the basement that provide the perfect sense, origin, and explanation. It is true, however, that real epidemics are hardly described strictly in terms of the SIR model (or one of the variants like SIS, SIRS, etc). Nevertheless, it is almost impossible to "speak" the language of the mathematical description of epidemics at any level of complexity, without having the SIR model in mind. If a physics metaphor could be applied, we would say that the SIR model is for epidemics dynamics as the harmonic oscillator is for physics. But the metaphor can not be sustained at all levels because different from the given physical example, the SIR equations lack an analytic solution. To obtain the time evolution of the S, I, and R quantities we have to resort on numerical integration of the finite differences representation of the SIR equations. Fortunately, from the 1980, the increasing power of affordable computers made the finding of numerical solutions a trivial task, avoiding all the pain of obtaining them by hand or with the help of pocket calculators. But the present facilities do not diminish the beauty and intellectual satisfaction of an analytic solution. In this contribution we present a close solution for the classical SIR model as was formulated by Kermack-McKendrick.

Except for SIS model, the simplest of all epidemic models, whose differential equations, because of the $S + I = 1$ constrain, end up to be a single and solvable one: the Riccati equation, all the others, remarkably the SIR one, which was the originally presented by Kermack-McKendrick, lack a close analytic solution for their differential equations. While analytic tools like stability analysis, asymptotic analysis, or phase diagram analysis can be used to get some insight into the behavior of these models, by close analytic solution we mean the temporal evolution of the number of infectives or susceptibles, and this is what we want to pursue in this contribution. In doing this task we first present a solution which is exact and closed except for one integral. To cope with the integral, we make a series expansion in the denominator of the integrate which then we express in fractional form check carefully technical names Integration by Partial Fractions. Finally we make an approximation, which is then numerically well justified, which allows us to arrive at the final solution of the SIR model.

II. SIR MODEL AND THE INTEGRAL FORM

The differential equation of the Kermack-McKendrick model are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{d\tau} &= -R_0 SI \\ \frac{dI}{d\tau} &= R_0 SI - I \\ \frac{dR}{d\tau} &= I, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where S, I, and R represent respectively the fraction of susceptible, infected, and removed subjects inside a population of fixed size. This is the no vital dynamics version of the model where the condition $S + I + R = 1$ holds. $R_0 = \beta/\gamma$ is the basic reproduction number and $\tau = \gamma t$. To obtain the time evolution of the state of the

* alexsandromc@unisinos.br
† sgonc@if.ufrgs.br

epidemic it is necessary to integrate the equations (1), which can not be performed in this case. Kermack and McKendrick, from the first and third differential equations (Eq. 1), arrive to the following expression for $S(R)$:

$$S(\tau) = (1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 R(\tau)} \tag{2}$$

in which it is assumed that there are no removed subjects at the beginning of the infection ($R(0) = 0$) and $I(0) = i_0$ is the initial fraction of infected subjects. From that expression they obtain an independent differential equation for the removed subjects:

$$\frac{dR}{d\tau} = I = 1 - R - (1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 R} \tag{3}$$

At this point they go further by using a strong approximation valid for $R \ll 1$ (only valid for initial times or very weak epidemics). Here, we make a change of variables to $w = R_0(1 - R)$, in terms of which, the last equation results $dw/d\tau = R_0(1 - i_0)\exp[-R_0 + w] - w$. Given the initial condition $S(0) = 1 - i_0$, where $I(0) = i_0$ is the initial fraction of infected subjects and the definition of w, we have $w(0) = R_0$ and $dw/d\tau|_{\tau=0} = -R_0 i_0$. Thus, we can express the three quantities (S, I, R) in terms of w, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} S(\tau) &= (1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 + w(\tau)} \\ I(\tau) &= \frac{w(\tau)}{R_0} - (1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 + w(\tau)} \\ R(\tau) &= 1 - \frac{w(\tau)}{R_0} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Therefore, the problem of solving the original S, I, R differential equations of the Kermack Mc-Kendrick model, Eq. (1), was translated into solving the equation for w whose formal solution can be expressed in term of an integral:

$$\int \frac{dw(\tau)}{R_0(1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 + w(\tau)} - w(\tau)} = \tau + k, \tag{5}$$

where k is a constant of integration. We will see in the next section how we can compute this integral.

III. ALGEBRAIC SOLUTION

In the previous section we have translated the SIR problem of solving the set of differential equations into the quest of a primitive for the integral (5). However, as far as we know, there is no such a primitive; therefore we use a functional form that represent the integrand in the hope that the functional form can be integrated somehow.



Figura 1. (A) The two real roots of $P(w)$, z_1, z_2, as functions of R_0. Symbols represent numerical solutions of Eq. (6) while the lines are the analytical relations obtained from Eq. (9). (B) Module ratio of the complex residual part, $F(w)$, and integrand of Eq. (5), $1/P(w)$. Initial condition $i_0 = 10^{-3}$.

We call the denominator of the integrand of Eq. (5) as

$$\begin{aligned} P(w) &= R_0(1 - i_0)e^{-R_0 + w} - w \\ &= R_0(1 - i_0)e^{-R_0}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{w^j}{j!} - w \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and replace the exponential by its Taylor expansion in the second expression. Then, considering $P(w)$ as a polynomial over complex numbers, we can write the inverse of $P(w)$ as a partial fraction expansion:

$$\frac{1}{P(w)} = \sum_j \frac{A(z_j)}{w - z_j} + F(w)\ , \tag{7}$$

where z_j are the real roots of $P(w)$. The coefficients $A(z_j)$ are given by

$$A(z_j) = \left(\frac{dP(w)}{dw}\right)^{-1}_{w=z_j} = \frac{1}{R_0 e^{-R_0}e^{z_j} - 1} \tag{8}$$



Figura 2. Dynamics of the Susceptible-Infected-Removed (SIR) model for (A) $R_0 = 2$ and (B) $R_0 = 10$, initial condition $i_0 = 10^{-3}$. Numerical solution (dashed line) refers to the numerical integration of the Eq. (1) and algebraic solution (solid line) refers to numerical computation of Eq. (4) and (12).



Figura 3. (A) Percentage relative error on removed $R(t)$ as function of R_0 and i_0. Two cross-section cuts or views of the previous curve: (B) cut at $i_0 = 10^{-3}$ and (C) cut at $R_0 = 5$.

and $F(w)$ represents the complex residual part, i.e, the partial fraction decomposition including the complex roots.

Straight for one note that are two roots (if $R_0 > 1$):

$$z_1 = R_0\left(1 + \frac{i_0}{R_0 - 1}\right) \quad (i_0 \ll 1)$$
$$z_2 = R_0\left(1 - R(\infty)\right) \tag{9}$$

where $R(\infty) = 1-(1-i_0)\exp\left[-R_0 R(\infty)\right]$ is the asymptotic limit of the removed. By simple numerical inspection of Eq. (6), Fig. 1A, we can see that for values above the threshold ($R_0 > 1$) z_1 and z_2 are the only real roots. After this considerations we can write the Eq. (7) as

$$\frac{1}{P(w)} = \frac{A(z_1)}{w - z_1} + \frac{A(z_2)}{w - z_2} + F(w) \tag{10}$$

In order to verify the contribution of $F(w)$, we investigated (numerically) the module ratio between $F(w)$ and $1/P(w)$, $|F(w)P(w)|$. In the Fig. 1B we see that $|F(w)P(w)|$ is small. So, we assume that $F(w) \simeq 0$. Then, we can write

$$\tau + k = \int \frac{dw}{P(w)}$$
$$\simeq A(z_1)\ln\left[w - z_1\right] + A(z_2)\ln\left[w - z_2\right] \tag{11}$$

where we obtain k doing $w(0) = R_0$. Finally, we can approximately determine the integral (5) as

$$\tau \simeq \frac{\ln\left[\frac{w(\tau) - R_0(1-R(\infty))}{R_0 R(\infty)}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{-R_0 R(\infty)} - 1} + \frac{\ln\left[\frac{w(\tau)(1-R_0) - R_0(1-R_0-i_0)}{R_0 i_0}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{\frac{R_0 i_0}{R_0 - 1}} - 1} \tag{12}$$

This way, based on Eq. (4) and (12), the SIR dynamics can be algebraically obtained given the following initial conditions: $S(0) = 1 - i_0$, $I(0) = i_0$ and $R(0) = 0$. Note that the function $\omega(\tau)$ has no inverse (which would be the ideal situation), however that does not keep us of getting an explicit representation of the dynamics, i.e to obtain explicit functions for the three quantities S, I, and R. Fig. 2 shows a comparison between the numerical integration of the differential equations (Eq. (1)) and

the (numerically computed) proposed algebraic solution (Eq. (4) and (12)).

IV. INSPECTION OF THE ALGEBRAIC SOLUTION

More detailed inspection of that figure as it displayed in Fig. 2B indicates that the agreement is not perfect as a consequence of the approximation done in Eq. (4). In order to quantify the error of the algebraic solution, we compute the relative differences between removed $R(t)$ obtained from the numerical solution of the differential equations (Eq. 1) and from the present solution (Eq. (4) and (12)), averaged up to the asymptotic state, as follows:

$$Error = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{|R_N(\tau_k) - R_A(\tau_k)|}{R_N(\tau_k)} \times 100 \qquad (13)$$

where $N = int(\tau_F/d\tau)$, $int(x) = \max\{m \in Z | m \leq x\}$, and $\tau_k = (k-1)d\tau$. In order to evaluate such error we take $d\tau = 10^{-3}$ (time step of the numerical integration) and $R(\tau_F) = 0.99R(\infty)$ (asymptotic or final time). The labels N and A refer to numerical and algebraic solutions, respectively. In Fig. 3A we present the percentage error as defined above versus the basic reproductive number R_0 and initial fraction of infected subjects i_0. It can be seen that the error is sensitive to both R_0 and the initial fraction of infected i_0. In particular, if $i_0 < 10^{-3}$, the $Error$ is proportional to $\log R_0$ (see Fig. 3B). Furthermore, the $Error$ is practically constant in relation to i_0 (see Fig. 3C). Using linear regression method we estimate that $Error(R_0, i_0) \simeq 9 \log R_0$.

V. CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALGEBRAIC SOLUTION

From the previous results, we can arrive at an analytic expression for the time of the infection peak, τ_p. For that purpose we plug the expressions $w(\tau_p) = R_0 - \ln[R_0(1-i_0)]$ into the equation Eq. (12), we obtain

$$\tau_p \simeq \frac{\ln\left[1 - \frac{\ln[R_0(1-i_0)]}{R_0 R(\infty)}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{-R_0R(\infty)} - 1} + \frac{\ln\left[1 - \frac{(1-R_0)\ln[R_0(1-i_0)]}{R_0 i_0}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{\frac{R_0 i_0}{R_0 - 1}} - 1}. \qquad (14)$$

In the Fig. 4A we present the τ_p as function of R_0. Note that previous equation is according with the numerical solution (numerical integration Eq. (1)). This last result, together with the expression for the basic reproductive number, R_0, the asymptotic fraction of removed subjects $R(\infty)$, and the maximum fraction of infected



Figura 4. Comparison between algebraic and numerical solutions for (A) time of the infection peak and (B) fraction of immunized. Initial condition $i_0 = 10^{-3}$.

people, I_{max}, i.e,

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \qquad (15)$$

$$I_{max} = 1 - \frac{1}{R_0}\left(1 + \ln[R_0(1-i_0)]\right) \qquad (16)$$

$$R(\infty) = 1 - (1-i_0)e^{-R_0R(\infty)}, \qquad (17)$$

represent in algebraic form the principal quantities of the SIR model (presented in the original article of Kermack-McKendrick).

It is worth noting that the above results allow us to obtain close expression for other important quantities related to extensions of the Kermack-McKendrick formulation, such is the case of the immunization necessary to stop an epidemic. According to Anderson and May [2], the fraction of the population f that have to be vaccinated in order to stop the spread of the disease in the population, is $f = 1 - 1/(R_0 S(0))$. However, in many cases, we can not immunize the population before the start of the infection process. Thus, we can generalize the expression of the fraction of immunized with a time dependence,

$f(\tau) = 1 - 1/(R_0 S(\tau))$. Note that with the assistance of the Eq. (4) and Eq. (12), we have algebraic expression for the fraction of individuals that should be immunized in time τ for the disease to be extinct. To do so, just make the substitution $w(\tau) = R_0 - \ln\left[R_0\left(1 - i_0\right)\left(1 - f(\tau)\right)\right]$ in the Eq. (12), results

$$\tau \simeq \frac{\ln\left[1 - \frac{\ln[R_0(1-i_0)(1-f(\tau))]}{R_0 R(\infty)}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{-R_0 R(\infty)} - 1} + \frac{\ln\left[1 - \frac{(1-R_0)\ln[R_0(1-i_0)(1-f(\tau))]}{R_0 i_0}\right]}{R_0(1-i_0)e^{\frac{R_0 i_0}{R_0 - 1}} - 1}. \quad (18)$$

Fig. 4B shows the dynamics of the fraction of immunized. Note that in the initial moments of spread of the epidemic $f(\tau)$ remains constant. However, as time progresses, the fraction of the population to be immunized falls significantly as it approaches the peak time of infection. Evidently, $f(\tau) = 0$ if $\tau \geq \tau_p$ since that $S(\tau) \leq 1/R_0$.

VI. FINAL REMARKS

We have presented an algebraic solution for an important and long standing problems of the mathematical biology, which is the solution of the well know equations of the SIR model as presented by Kermack and McKendrick.

In this solution the dynamics of the fraction of susceptible S, infected I, and removed R is given explicitly in terms of a time-dependent expression $w(\tau)$ (Eq. (4)). Using some approximations, we have displayed an way for $w(\tau)$ (Eq. (12)). Thus, we represented the approximate solution of model as an implicit equation that has the role to introduce the dynamics in the different classes S,I e R.

We checked that the solution has a good agreement with the numerical implementation of the equations that describes the model (Eq. (1)) over the entire dynamic for different threshold values. We showed that the difference between these solutions (algebraic and numeric) is proportional to the logarithm of the epidemic threshold R_0. In this sense, the error in the proposed solution is small and grows slowly as the value of R_0.

Lastly, this approach allowed us to represent analytically two key quantities: time of the infection peak (Eq. (14)) and fraction of immunized (Eq. (18)).

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge support from the Brazilian agencies CNPq and CAPES and partial support.

[1] Kermack, W. and McKendrick, A., Proceeding of Royal Society A **115** (1927) 700.
[2] Anderson, R. M. and May, R. M., Infectious Diseases in Humans (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992).